

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



M

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/786,191	05/24/2001	Henri-Georges Bois	03715.0080 5212		
75	90 12/04/2002				
Finnegan Henderson Farabow Garrett & Dunner 1300 I Street NW			EXAMINER HUYNH, LOUIS K		
			3721	<u>-</u>	
			DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002	DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · ·		Application No.	<del></del>	Applicant(s)	· · · · · · · ·
	•			BOIS, HENRI-GEORGES	
Office Action Summary		09/786,191 Examiner		Art Unit	, 0
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	Louis K. Huynh	sheet with the co	3721 arrespondence address	
Period fo		peuro on are oover		,,,,copondono dadroco	
THE N - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failui - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing digital patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, howe oly within the statutory min will apply and will expire to te, cause the application to	ver, may a reply be time mum of thirty (30) days SIX (6) MONTHS from the become ABANDONED	will be considered timely. he mailing date of this communication (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	May 2001 and 28	December 2001		
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ T	his action is non-fi	nal.		
3)□ Dispositi	Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under on of Claims				ts is
4)🛛	Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application	n.			
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from considera	ation.		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.				
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirer	ment.		
Applicati	on Papers				
9)🖾 ¯	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.			
10)🛛 🗆	Γhe drawing(s) filed on <u>24 May 2001</u> is/are: a)	⊠ accepted or b)□	objected to by the	e Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- · ·			
11) 🔲 🗆	The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)∏ approve	d b)⊡ disapprov	ved by the Examiner.	
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	• •	ion.		
12)[] 7	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer.			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13)🛛	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).	
a)[	☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documen	its have been rece	ived.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been rece	ived in Applicatio	on No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price application from the International Business the attached detailed Office action for a list	ureau (PCT Rule 1	7.2(a)).	•	
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domes		•		ration)
• "	) $\square$ The translation of the foreign language pr		• • •		ration).
15) 🗌 A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes				
Attachment	•	🗖		(DTO 440) D	
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲		(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)	<b>-</b> ·
S. Patent and Tr TO-326 (Re		Action Summary		Part of Paper	No. 6

Art Unit: 3721

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Specification

1. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). Although an abstract has been provided in the PCT/FR00/01903, an abstract should be provided on a separate sheet in accordance with current US practice.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because independent claims 1 and 19 are single means claims.

A single means claim, i.e., where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means, is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In re Hyatt, 708 F.2d 712, 714-715, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (A single means claim which covered every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose was held nonenabling for the scope of the claim because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor.). When claims depend on a recited property, a fact situation comparable to Hyatt is possible, where the claim covers every conceivable structure (means) for achieving the stated property (result) while the specification discloses at most only those known to the inventor. MPEP 2164.08(a).

Art Unit: 3721

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is generally narrative, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. The claim appears to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document.

Claim 1, lines 1-2: "An apparatus for forming bags comprising a continuously traveling film" renders the claim in definite because the film is not a part of the apparatus. Applicant should utilize the "wherein" clause to define that the bags is formed from a continuous traveling film.

Claim 1, line 5: "means for treating the film" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Claim 2, line 2: "mechanical feeler" is vague and indefinite for it is unclear as to what mechanism applicant is referring.

Claim 6, lines 2-3: "the tubular bag blank" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Claim 6, line 3: "in this way" is indefinite for it is unclear as to what way applicant is referring.

Claim 6, line 3: "means suitable for closing the bag" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Claim 8, lines 1-2: "comprising a film ... function" renders the claim indefinite because the film is not a part of the apparatus.

Art Unit: 3721

Claim 11, line 3: "or" renders the claim indefinite for it is unclear whether or not the complementary closure strip, tear/cut tapes and adhesive tapes are all included on the tape.

Applicant should use the phrase "one of...and..."

Claim 19, line 5: "the means for cyclically processing the film" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Claim 21, lines 2-3: "the means ... transversely" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Claim 25, lines 2-3: "means ... transversely" lacks proper antecedent basis.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-14, 16, 19-21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Talbott et al. (US 4,745,731).

Talbott discloses an apparatus an a method for forming bags wherein the interengagement of the closure strips (22, 23) on a film (18) traveling through a form-fill-seal machine (13) are sensed by detectors (21, 35) (column 4, lines 57-68).

With respect to claims 2 and 20, the detector (35) is a mechanical feeler since it is designed to feel the differential pressure of air

With respect to claim 6, the form-fill-seal machine (13) includes means (28, 29) for shaping the film into a tubular state, means (24) for filling the tubular bag blank and means (14) for closing the bag.

Application/Control Number: 09/786,191 Page 5

Art Unit: 3721

With respect to claims 9 and 10, the apparatus of Talbott includes feed rollers for causing the film to travel horizontally and vertically (Figure 1).

With respect to claims 13 and 21, the detectors (21, 35) detects the presence of the closure strip (inherent), the detectors (21) detects the proper feeding of the closure strips in both transverse and longitudinal direction of the film.

With respect to claims 14 and 16, the apparatus of Talbott includes dual detectors (21) for detecting the closure strips (22, 23) that are juxtaposed in the longitudinal travel direction of the film.

8. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-14, 16, 19-21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by PAJ (Patent abstract of Japan 11165362).

PAJ discloses an apparatus an a method for forming bags wherein the intermeshing of the fasteners (52, 53) on a film (51) traveling through a form-fill-seal machine (13) are sensed by a detector (11), the detector (11) including a contact (11d) for feeling the thickness level of the fasteners (52, 53) intermeshing with each other (Solution) as well as for detecting the proper feeding of the fasteners (inherent).

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

<sup>(</sup>a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3721

10. Claims 3, 4, 15, 17 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Talbott et al. (US 4,745,731) or over PAJ (Paten Abstract of Japan 11165362).

With respect to claims 3 and 4, the location of the detectors is obvious as a matter of engineering design choice since it does not solve any stated problem insofar as the record is concerned and thus does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the applied prior art.

With respect to claims 15, 17 and 22-23, the orientation of the closure strips with respect to the travel direction of the film is obvious to an ordinary skilled person in the art as a matter of engineering choice since it does not solve any stated problem insofar as the record is concerned and thus does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the applied prior art.

Furthermore, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the apparatus of Talbott and/or of PAJ by having provided detectors that are suitable for detecting the interengagement of the closure strips in according to the orientation of the closure strips with respect to the travel direction of the film.

11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Talbott et al. (US 4,745,731) or over PAJ (Paten Abstract of Japan 11165362) in view of Ausnit (US 4,876,842).

The apparatus of Talbott and/or of PAJ meet all of applicant's claimed subject matter but lacks the specific teaching of the means for fixing closure strips onto the film.

Art Unit: 3721

However, Ausnit discloses a means (42) for fixing the fasteners (17) onto the traveling film (13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the apparatus of Talbott and/or of PAJ by having provided a means for fixing the closure strips onto the film, as taught by Ausnit, in order to attached the closure strip onto the film when the film and the closure strips are fed separately.

#### Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Louis K. Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 306-5694. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I. Rada can be reached on (703) 308-2187. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3579 for regular communications and (703) 308-7769 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

LH December 2, 2002

PRIMARY EXAMINER